

This work has been submitted to **NECTAR**, the **Northampton Electronic Collection of Theses and Research**.

Conference or Workshop Item

Title: Revising national/diasporic imaginaries: Bollywood & diasporic Indian cinema and globalization

Creators: Wilson, J. M.

Example citation: Wilson, J. M. (2014) Revising national/diasporic imaginaries: Bollywood & diasporic Indian cinema and globalization. Invited Keynote presented to: *International Conference on Diasporic Indian Cinemas and Bollywood on the Diaspora: Re-Imagings and Re-Possessions, University of Osmania, Hyderabad, India, 22-24 January 2014.*

Version: Presented version

<http://nectar.northampton.ac.uk/6307/>



CASII and OUCIP Conference

'Disaporic Indian Cinemas and Bollywood on the Diaspora: Re-Imagings and Re-Possessions'.
Hyderabad 22-24 January 2104

Revising National / Diasporic Imaginaries: Bollywood & Diasporic Indian Cinemas and Globalization

Janet Wilson, University of Northampton, UK

Outline

1. Introduction: the liberalization of Indian cinema in the 1990s
2. The 'happy diaspora family' genre
3. The new NRI and the state: *Dilwale Dulhania le Jayenge* (The True of Heart Will Win the Bride) (1995 (DDL)); *Kabhi Khushi Kabhi Gham* (Sometimes Happiness Sometimes Sadness) (2001). Dir. Koran Johar. (3KG)
Kal No Haa No (Tomorrow Happens or Doesn't Happen). Dir Nikhil Advani (2004)
4. Revising Diasporic Imaginaries
5. Conclusion: Reception of Bollywood/Indian Cinemas in the Diaspora.

1. In the contemporary epoch [...] the father as the authoritative figure of power embeds the political within it. The symbolism of political economy and cultural form come together, with the state's withdrawal from the determination of cultural hierarchies and investments now mirrored in its absence in the fiction of the globalizing nation [...]. The affective ties of community are decisively supplanted by social rules of inclusion and exclusion overseen by the baleful and punitive presence of father figures (Vasudevan 2011, 367).

2. [Bollywood's] modes 'of reception are fragmented enough to destabilize the seeming unity within' and thus Bollywood can be a conduit for dominant Hindu ideology but it can also carry 'deconstructive or transgressive moments' (Ansari 2005, 33, citing Mishra 2002).

3. Ingredients designed with the so-called NRI diasporan in mind do not necessarily lead to a concerted set of identifications from British Asians. In fact it often [...] leads to the obverse—a disidentification albeit momentary and contingent, a disassociation that could rest side by side with, though in tension the emotional and enjoyable effects of films (Kaur 2005: 315).

4. The national project is not fixed but, in a transnational framework, continues to enlist and be challenged by a global audience [...] as Bollywood continues to 'invite its diasporic audiences, their imagined communities, to collaborate in nation-building across boundaries' (Ansari 2007).

5. Bollywood film continues to chart new trajectories and [...] continually requestions the very concept of a 'national cinema proper' [...] via a thoroughly improper aesthetic that Sumita Chakravarty (1993) has called 'impersonation'. Yet as an imaginary state – in a double sense, i.e. as a film (and thus 'imaginary' in Metz's sense of the term) and as a national construct—Bollywood, rather than

fuelling [...] a 'desire for origins', functions as a challenge to this latter construct's very cognitive rationale (Gehlawat 2010, 144).

6. The balance of power in Bollywood has shifted in a westward direction as producers chase increasingly internationalized audiences. The danger that this represents for Indian producers [...] is that they may soon find themselves in a peripheral capacity to a global entertainment industry run out of corporate offices in Los Angeles, New York and London rather than locally controlling the content of Hindi films (Schaefer and Karan, p. 121).

Bibliography

- Ansari, Usmah. 'Tempting Sights and Seven Seas: The Diasporic Self, Bollywood and the Gendered Politics of National Longing.' In Jolly, Wadhwani and Barretto, pp. 104-121.
- Bhattacharya, Nandini. *Hindi Cinema: Repeating the Subject* (London: Palgrave, 2013)
- Brosius, Christiane. 'The Scattered Homelands of the Migrant: Bollywood through the Diasporic Lens.' In Kaur and Sinha, pp. 207-17.
- Dickey, Sara and Rajinder Dudrah, eds. *South Asian Cinema: Widening the Lens* (London: Routledge 2012)
- Gehlawat, Ajay. *Reframing Bollywood: Theories of Popular Hindi Cinema* (London: Sage, 2010).
- Jolly, Gurbir, Zenia Wadhwani and Deborah Barretto, eds, *Once Upon a Time in Bollywood: The Global Swing in Hindi Cinema*, (Tsar Publications, 2007).
- Joshi, Priya. 'Bollylite in America.' In Dickey and Dudrah, pp. 39-52.
- Kaur, Ravinder and Ajay J. Sinha, eds., *Bollywood: Popular Indian Cinema through a Transnational Lens*, ed. Ravinder Kaur and Ajay J Sinha (London: Sage 2005).
- Kaur, Ravinder. 'Cruising on the Vilayeti Bandwagon: Diasporic Representations and reception of Popular Indian Movies.' In Kaur and Sinha, pp. 309-28.
- Mehta, Monika. 'Globalizing Bombay Cinema: Reproducing the Indian State and Family'. In Jolly, Wadhwani and Barretto, pp. 30-40.
- Schaefer, David J. and Kavita Karan, eds. *Bollywood and Globalization: the Global Power of Popular Hindi Cinema* (London: Routledge 2013).
- Schaefer, David J. and Kavita Karan, 'Indian Women and Global Bollywood'. In Schaefer and Karan, pp. 119-123.
- Vijay Mishra. *Bollywood Cinema: Temples of Desire* (London: Routledge, 2002).
- Vasudevan, Ravi. *The Melodramatic Public: Film Form and Spectatorship in Indian Cinema* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

Filmography

- Dilwale Dulhania le Jayenge* (The True of Heart Will Win the Bride) (1995). Dir. Aditya Chopra. (DDLJ)
- English/Vinglish*. Dir. Gauri Shinde (2013).
- Kabhi Khushi Kabhi Gham* (Sometimes Happiness Sometimes Sadness) (2001). Dir. Karan Johar. (3KG)
- Kal Ho Naa Ho* (Tomorrow May Never Come). (2004). Dir. Nikhil Advani
- Mohabbatein*, Dir. Aditya Chopra (2000).
- Monsoon Wedding*. Dir. Meera Nair (2001).

Revising National / Diasporic Imaginaries: Bollywood & Diasporic Indian Cinema and Globalization

Introduction

Bollywood/Indian Diaspora cinema and neoliberalization

I am honoured to be presenting at this conference but challenged in that my knowledge of Hindi cinema is far less than most people here. When I came to do the research for this paper I was in Auckland and it was only with difficulty that I found a Hindi cinema shop, When I got the films home I found they had no subtitles; and so as a non Hindi speaker, I watched them all for their gestures imagining what the characters were saying. It has been a process of slow acquaintance and this talk is written very much from an outsider's western standpoint.

The success story of Bollywood/Indian Diaspora cinema is one of the great phenomena of globalization. The liberalization policies of the Indian government in the late 1990s and encouragement of foreign investment in order to benefit from the new global modes of production opened Hindi cinema up to global audiences. Global and transnational images appearing in its transnational narratives about families and marriages, redefined and repositioned the national. India has now become a brand name associated with Bollywood, and the nation and its diasporas have become reconfigured through a consolidation and expansion of the dominant heteronormative workings of earlier Bollywood cinema (Bhattacharya))

Films by directors such as Karan Johar, Aditya Chopra, and Nikhil Advani can be interpreted almost exclusively through the lens of diaspora, for their appeal to upper middle class Indians living diasporically aimed at reinforcing the

positive bonds of society, religion **and Hindu ethnicity**; secondly, at encouraging such Diasporic Indians to consolidate that emotional and national identification by investing financially, in Indian cinema. The combination of a globally disseminated cinema and a corporate financial infrastructure dictated by the global marketplace rather than the nation, and the new emphasis on the (Non Returning Indian) NRI as a positive, dynamic character who subscribes to and supports national values in diaspora, introduced a revision of national imaginaries, one that reinfects the ideologies of gender, class and religion with a transnational Hindutva modernism and capitalist consumerism. The successful solicitation of diaspora audiences by these narratives of global consumer mobility which show partial reconciliations of Eastern and Western values, has been central to their global success especially in prime diaspora marketplaces in the USA and UK.

My topic also concerns representations of what I call ‘diaspora imaginaries’ (of host nations like the UK and the USA where these films have had their greatest successes) in relation to national imaginaries—I see the two as symbiotically related. In the final part of this paper I will consider how Bollywood/Indian Diaspora cinema is read and interpreted in the diaspora: how are national reconstructions received by diaspora audiences – do they make corresponding, (often nostalgic) realignments between home and nation? Are images conducive to national belonging transplanted by transnationalism that delimits the idea of the nation state, and hence the idea of Indianness?

To talk of Indian Diaspora cinema/Bollywood, is to refer to the Bombay-based film industry of Hindi cinema, which since the 1990s has moved beyond this base

-- and to begin with I need to clarify this definition. Among the many arguments about defining Bollywood cinema, there is agreement that it is 'nationally dominant' but not a national cinema or even the national cinema (xii), **[this would be a misrecognition or mischaracterization because it would be to acknowledge the inclusive category of the Hindu (to which it mainly refers) as representative of the nation ('Bollywood and the Frictions of Global Mobility', Nitin Govil in *Bollywood Reader*, p. 201 ff)]**. Secondly even though the Tamil, Telugulam and Malayam industries produce more films annually the Hindi film industry generates more revenue, mainly because of its success rate overseas, because Hindi films are released in all the five distribution territories including the overseas one which after the 1990s became the biggest. But although Bollywood/Indian Diaspora Cinemas are one of the **key cultural sites for evoking a national imaginary**—what this consists of requires further refinement in relation to the globalization of such images. For example can such generalisations as Ravinder Kaur's that 'the family is metonym for the nation and vice versa' really be sustained? **[Generalisations such as Ravinder Kaur's that the 'concept of the nation state remains critical in defining Bollywood, just as Bollywood remains a constitutive force in popularising the national']**. In the next section, I identify reimaginings of India as found in dramas of everyday family life, informed by the contradictions and conflicts between modernity and tradition that globalization has produced, as well as consumer-oriented family resolutions. There is also the influence of the spectacular elements of, dance, performance and musical repertoire in this cinema of excess, which has led to the proliferation of a fantasy space and the encouragement of diverse dreams and fantasies (Kaur and Sinha, in their

introduction to Bollywood, 15). As a highly performative cinema, its so-called 'aesthetics of impersonation', also contributes to the ways that global Bollywood/ Indian diaspora cinema reconstructs, yet displaces the national.

2. The 'happy diaspora family' genre

The shift towards globalization began in 1998 when the state granted commercial cinema the status of a legitimate industry, yet persisted in its regulatory function, reinscribing its authority in the context of globalization. **OHP** Although the earlier censorship and taxation strategies relaxed, there was a more covert form of control, through the promotion of good family films. Such as *Pardes (Foreign Land, 1997)*; *Kuch Kuch Hoota Hai – Something happens (1998)*, *Dilwale Dilhania Le Jayenge, The Brave Hearted will Take Away the Bride (1995)*; *Kabbie Kashie Kabbie Gham (Sometime Sadness Sometimes Happiness, 2001)*. All these family romance films represent a transition from the 'angry young man' films of the 1970s and 1980s in which Amitabh Bachchan made his name, starring as the man of resistance. The post-liberalization cinema, according to critic Ashish Rajadhyaksha, addresses its audiences as part of an extended family 'on the basis of shared values', represented culturally as national values. Central to images of domestic harmony in the 'diaspora delight film', or the 'diaspora romance', is the family wedding ceremony, as found in *Dilwale Dulhaniya Le Jayenge (Aditya Chopra, 1995)* [and imitated in other films like *Monsoon Wedding (2001* and the recent, *English/Vinglish (2013)* set in New York] celebrated as the apotheosis of traditional Hindu values of trust, harmony and love, reinforced by religious ceremony and the overcoming of all obstacles (finance, rivalry). The issues raised by individual choice dictated by romantic

love over the arranged marriage, and the need for parental consent to abandon the planned match, which they share in common, can be traced to the feudal family romance cinema of the 1930s and 40s which even then was central to Indian cinema because it crossed classes. This popular format (374 WHO), is now adapted successfully to the circumstances of the new transnational diaspora subject, the wealthy upper-middle class NRI male.

Family films of melodrama became primary cultural articulations of liberalisation because it was recognised that a certain kind of cinema was needed to involve the diaspora marketplace and stave off the threat of westernization and the dangers of unregulated viewing via satellite . They were seen as a safe option. The family collective was linked to the nation in stories about kinship ties that bind even in absence (for example return journeys to negotiate betrothals and attend wedding). The diaspora communities were encouraged to see themselves as part of a big family, drawn imaginatively into the nation under the umbrella of Hindutva, based on Indian nationalism (Bhattacharya, 152), traceable to the collusion between religious nationalism and economic neoliberalism with rise of the right wing Hindi BJP Bharitya Janata Party in the mid 1990s. But the reality of the violence which underlies neoliberal nationalism is suppressed and their synthesizing homogenizing narratives omit any reference to rural poor, to political divisions, to religious minorities, and have limited reference to women as subjects in their own right.

3. The New Image of the NRI and the Nation-State

Case Studies: *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge* (1995) (the brave of heart will take away the bride) and *Khabie Kushi Khabie Gham* (2001) ; *Kal No Haa No* (Tomorrow Happens or Doesn't Happen, dir Nikhil Advani, 2004)

To discuss whether the hegemonic narratives, globalized production and dissemination systems of post-liberalised cinema fulfill its aims to imaginatively (and financially) involve the diaspora communities and create closer ties with the motherland, I will focus on three films, all of which feature the star, Shah Rukh Khan, as the embodiment of the NRI ideal. The first two have an ideological focus mainly on Hindi values; although their settings, divided between India and the UK, show the global orientation of a corporatised consumerism, they continue looking to India as the original homeland, and to subscribe to Indian (i.e. Hindu) religious, cultural and ethical values; the third, *Kal Ho Naa Ho*, is set entirely in the USA, and its narrative solution to issues of love and marriage is highly individualistic, and cuts across traditional Indian values. All three films dated 1995, 2001 and 2004, show a gradual disengagement from the 'myth of India as the original homeland; they represent a shift occurring in this decade as Western locations and values begin to replace Eastern ones.

Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge (The One with a True Heart Will win the bride—Producer Yash Chopra Screen Aditya Chopra), is seminal for the reinvention of the genre. It offers a mise en scene appropriate for new types of commercial commoditization (Vasudevan, 8) while also being commended for its lack of vulgarity and violence—i.e. no explicit sexuality-- for being clean, morally uplifting and suitable for watching by all the family (ALberoi –Bollywood Reader) It persuaded as a believable fantasy --mimetic projection -- as an ideal of harmonious family life its format seen as suitable for reshaping a stronger

sense of national belonging: a romantic love story, family relations, and presented its own genealogy by referring to previous Hindi films intertextually, by including Hindi songs, so it had a familiar ring to many audiences (Monika Mehta); and this formula was repeated in countless other films.

The key change was to glamorise the role of the young male NRI, who in Hindi films of the 1970s and 80s was seen as selling out to the corrupt and dissolute values of the west; and to give him greater moral stature: By making him capable of becoming a national figure (i.e. subscribing to national or Hindu ideology) he apparently effects some reconciliation between East and West, although in my reading I see the outcome as a pulling away from the east toward the west, a movement also echoed in later films. The reformed NRI young Indian male is therefore a potential source of new Indianness, whose transnational mobility undercuts any hint of reformulated national essentialism, or an umbilical cord capable of anchoring all Indians to the past .

The hero, Raj (played by Shah Rukh Khan) appears as the spoilt son of a millionaire, carefree, paying no attention to education and lacking any worldly struggle such as the need to earn a living. He lives in the UK as does the heroine Simran, daughter of a lower middle class business man, Baldev, who has emigrated to make money. They meet on a trip to Europe and fall in love. Raj overturns his playboy image, showing fidelity to more traditional values when he comes to act as the guardian of his beloved's sexual purity: in a semi parodic/comic scene after she wakes up one morning in his bed, after having collapsed there having drunk some brandy, he teases her and eventually tells her that her virtue is intact. As in earlier Hindi films the preservation of the heroine's sexual purity remains the moral imperative in this remapping of national

boundaries; but the difference from earlier films is in the stylised teasing and semi mocking way the NRI handles this well defined trope, playing with audience expectations as well as Simran's fears.

Like *Khabie Kushie Khabie GHam* (3KG) and to a lesser extent *Kal No Haa No*, the narrative crux of DDLJ is one of intergenerational conflict. Simran's father wants her to marry the son of his friend from the Punjab, symbolising his desire to reaffiliate to the motherland. And (with reference to the diaspora imaginaries) although the family's life in diaspora is presented through the stylistic choices and plural cultural references of Simran and her sister whose blended clothes and musical preferences in London resemble those of other wealthy Diasporic families—the father's behavior and iconic dress **represents the film's transplanted Hinduism, just as happens in 3KG**. After Simran's family moves back to the Punjab the scenes of preparation for the engagement and wedding draw on traditional religious practices and she becomes a traditional Hindu woman in clothing and orientation, at first protesting against the arranged match and then conceding to her parents' wishes. In more technical terms she might be described as Anglo-Indian, equally at home in both cultures. Raj follows the family back to the Punjab to win his bride and takes up the challenge to persuade Baldev to release his daughter to the one she truly loves and renounce his earlier promise to his friend.

(see **QUOTE 1**) Critic Ravi Vasuevedan in his book, *The Melodramatic Public* (2011) argues that the nation-state plays no narrative role in films of the neo-liberal globalized economy, as for example it did in the seminal film *Mother India* (1957) where the erection of the dam in the wake of Independence casts into an ironic light the futility of Mother India's sacrifice. Vasuevedan argues

that the place of the state as the defining social power, is symbolically replaced by that of the **paterfamilias as the assertive arbiter of public identity**. This critical perception also applies to state relinquishment of other forms of control through the liberalization of the film industry, for example, after opening up to foreign investment there was reduced insistence on a nationally –prescribed aesthetic, opening the way for directors to utilise new technologies of filming and production for an imaging and production processes that makes Bollywood films as a product identifiable with ‘Brand India’.

On the surface, Vasudevan’s comment seems true of the three films I am examining. Simran remains in thrall to a patriarchal ideology because her partner Raj refuses to marry her without her father’s consent (so the arrangement is between two men); and the mother’s suggestion that the couple elope is rejected as inappropriate, even illegitimate. He insists on the proper authentic ‘family’ outcome. In 3KG, the dramatic focus is again on the dominating presence of the father, played by Amitabh Bachchan, who like Baldev in DDLJ, has to come to terms with his son’s wish to marry a woman of his own choice so rejecting his father’s arranged marriage, and hence his authority: in a tense scene his father casts him out of the family home (**IMAGE**). In *Kaal No Haa No* the father of the heroine, **Simian NAME?** is dead, her mother wants her to enter an arranged marriage, but in the end she marries Rohit, following a courtship manipulated by newly arrived NRI Amman, with whom Simian is really in love, and who sacrificed her to his friend, and instructs Rohit what to do. **IMAGE** Once more the contract is brokered by two men, and the film introduces in a playful teasing way, homoerotic overtones to their relationship.

By contrast to Vasuevedan, however, I would argue that the lack of any symbolic identification of the state as a narrative presence in these films and the limitation of state control over their direction, aesthetics and production (as increasingly films are made through co-productions outside India), finds a counterpart in the limited power of the patriarchal figure whom Vasuevedan claims fills the gap left by the state: by contrast the younger generation, especially the NRI, who urgently need to establish their own identities and discover the real meaning of love (after courtship) who challenge the older's rigid adherence to tradition, converting them to their point of view, provide the driving force of the films. The Bollywood films I have examined illustrate the dethronement of the paterfamilias, his assimilation into a more extended family nexus, and the assurance of a future which the NRI and his bride can establish on more western, less pietistic and traditional terms. That is, the achievement of post-liberalisation Bollywood film rests on establishing the transnational NRI's credibility as part of a desirable cosmopolitan lifestyle- one which appealed to the urban middle class Indian who overlaps with but is not the same as the Indians in diaspora (CHECK SHARPE) –The mobility of Raj in DDLJ (symbolized by his backpack –a traveller sojourner), his self motivation, economic self sufficiency, and determined facing up to Simran's family, all demonstrating his respect for traditional Hindu values, is a key to the film's globalizing structures.

The new consumer culture of global corporatization and commodification, to which DDLJ linked the 'Indianness' of the hybridized NRI is even more prominent in Koran Johar's film, *Kabhie Kushie Kabhie Gham* (2001), in which the family battle occurs within the context of a transnational Hindu modernity, which shows East and West as almost interchangeable ideologically,

because of their common matrix of capital conscious consumerism: threatened family values are located within a consumerised corporate lifestyle which shows no evidence of labour, domestic work or class struggle. After being turned out of the family home and cut off from his share in his father's business, the son returns to the UK and sets up as an independent entrepreneur, finding economic opportunity to earn millions like his father and so equalize himself: family values like morality, trust and devotion are overlaid by the globalized consumer lifestyle which is at the core of the reinvented imaginaries. The logic of the market place becomes a substitute for human relations as is evident in the son's ten year break from his parents. Yet even here, as in *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge*, the challenge from the NRI who wishes to marry the woman he loves—shows that the paternal insistence on piety, filial obedience, and duty, are overruled by the personal and lifestyle choices of the NRI, even though these are in significant ways repetitions of the fathers. **IMAGE** [However see different spatial embodiment of Bahchan's body, recast as not so towering as it is at the beginning and as it was in the earlier *Mohabbatein* (Dir. Aditya Chopra, 2000), but emerging on a horizontal plane linked to other family members, and demonstrating a lateral mode of identity, symbolic of his reduced authority]

These changes in the NRI character are also reflected in the new acting repertoire of Shah Rukh Khan. The male body which was defined in terms of spectacular resistance to society in films of the 1980s and the imposing figure of Amitabh Bachchan in films like *Mohabbatein* (Dir. Aditya Chopra, 2000), is transformed into a painless metropolitan corporeality, embodying a malleable masculinity, and normalized shape. This makes him closer to the audience. The NRI traverses separate gendered spheres, at ease with the new woman who has

a degree of independence and social economic equality, so able to hold her own; he is also more playful and experimental in his relations with other men as in *Kal No Haa Ho*, and projects more ambiguously gendered roles. That is, the NRI demonstrates a Hindustani identity that features an accessible, democratic metropolitanism, showing flexible adaptation to changing narrative locales, as he inhabits different territories of cultural reference and occupies a more diverse range of roles.

4. Revising of Diasporic Imaginaries:

To consider how the diaspora communities might respond to these revised national imaginings it is notable from an examination of the 'diaspora imaginaries' in Indian Cinema/Bollywood films, that states of longing for home and homeland in diaspora are minimal. Furthermore the predominance of fantasy and spectacle, and the cinema's excessive celebratory, performative style suggests that (for the younger generation at least) living diasporically is a release, a progression, not a series of problematic adjustments. Although DDLJ gives us the image of Baldev feeding the pigeons, transmuting into the dancing of the women in the mustard fields, suggesting nostalgia for his youth and the emotional value of the pledge to his friend (IMAGE) this is counter-balanced by images of his teenage daughters dancing in western style in the UK, and in the final scenes of the train pulling out with Raj, his father and Simran on board, presumably returning to a new life in the UK. (IMAGE) In 3KG, the transnational family seems oblivious to the diasporic transformations of home and homeland because of their capitalist, global values, [Concepts of family, duty and nation are preserved either a fantasy of tradition composed of consumer goods, family

mansions, --As XX says these offer **special comfort to assuage the nostalgia of India's Diasporic elite.**] Money and family as well as national locales are interchangeable in the corporatised world of high finance. Even in *Kal Ho Na Ho* set in the USA the problems suffered by the heroine stem entirely from family problems set in the pre film past in India; diaspora belonging and habitation is triumphantly summarized by the image of Amman against the American flag. (IMAGE). In this film where the father figure is absent and the ambiguity of the gender of the NRI hero is highlighted, the new world of the diaspora is defined without any visual reference to India at all.

5. The Reception of Bollywood/Indian Diaspora Cinemas in the Diaspora

So this brings me to the last section as to how these and other Indian Cinema/ Bollywood films might be received in the diaspora, when Bollywood is an apparatus for constructing the nation as well as representing it .

Among the many responses and empirical research done on the reception of Bollywood /Indian Diaspora film in the diaspora there is a consensus that simple dichotomized responses like nostalgia for the homelands in the service of a reactionary BJP Hindutva nationalism (as some see it) or resistance to the film's stories cannot be postulated. Diaspora communities as zones of identity construction have multiple often contradictory attachments and affiliations, and complex ways of locating meaning: **while the polysemic and pastiche-like nature of Hindi film narratives also lead to plural responses.**

1. It is probable that clean movies like DDLJ which represent cultural identity through the promulgation of moral values, are important for first generation diasporans who might aspire to 'the myth of return'. Hindi songs for example

that can be detached from their narrative sequences convey poignant reminders of belonging and so create 'a shared structure of feeling' (and even aspects of the narratives themselves) Mishra/Brosius.

2. One can also read in ways that disrupt the process of identity fixation caused by the normalizing, hegemonic ideologically bound narratives; the process of disidentification has been detailed by critics like Ravinder Kaur, and Usamah Ansari, who are diasporans themselves. (see Quotes) Interviews and other forms of empirical research, show enormous variation in different parts of the world e.g. London audiences are more playful and skeptical about Bollywood stories, than audiences in less urbanised regions or parts of the globe, because their identity formations are distributed among other activities, engagements and social sites (Kaur)

3. There remains the question of national signification, of Indianness that persists in the figure of the NRI. (whether we see this as an essentialised Indianness –reworked or reformulated-- or one that is by now transnational). But as Ajay Gehalawat says in *Reframing Bollywood*, (SEE QUOTE) the global dissemination of Bollywood Cinema means that it also questions the concept of a national cinema, and by extension what it means to be Indian. The disappearance of the state from the thematic, narrative and aesthetics of these films has led to the development of a particular cinema, in which Bollywood is a brand name signifying global status—a cross over status (e.g. when I flew here the Emirates film programme had a Bollywood Arabia category, alongside Arabic Cinema as well as all the different types of languages listed under Bollywood). So 'rather than encompassing a particular nation' it might more effectively be seen as possessing a particular aesthetic, one which is essentially hybrid and

transnational, mixing and reappropriating elements from multiple sources and redeploying them in a global context' (144); And my final point also from Gel what is that if it adapts appropriately through the aesthetic of 'impersonation' as an imaginary state (i.e. as a film), and as a nation a construct; rather than fuelling the desire for origins, it challenges the very cognitive rationale of such a search. The symbolic loss of the nation state as a presence in these films, and the slow disappearance of the compensating authority figure of the paterfamilias in the three I have examined (which might symbolise national traditions and cultural values), suggest that essentialised Indianness is being supplanted by images of transnationalism as embodied in the NRI. And my final quote is from recent empirical research on changing images of the woman in Bollywood cinema which predicts that the Anglo Indian woman will be supplanted by a Westernised Indian role as Indianness becomes a reduced presence in the market place and 'Bollywoodization' is predicted as the end of Indian Cinema.

In conclusion, I have made a very partial analysis: happy diaspora family films represent only one strand of the enormous generic range of Bollywood/Indian Diaspora Cinema, and there have been obvious changes in the last decade, but as it is the most successful at the box office and most widely viewed, changing repertoires, narrative orientations and styles of this genre can be used to judge significant shifts in the cinema more generally .

Women have some limited agency, in enforcing their wishes/desire for the partner she wants -- initially Simran in DDLJ rejects her father's offer of a suitor (perhaps due to her independence as a western subject when she first returns to the Punjab)-- Simran in *Kal Ho Naa Ho* make her own decision, despite her mother's hopes for an arranged marriage. But they do not manipulate the outcomes; while the older generation of mothers and aunts, are often no more than a source of pathos and piety generated by the repression of their children's desire.

New paradigms

Indianness a reduced cipher in global market place. (Gelhwat - preface)

'Bollywood and the Frictions of Global Mobility', Nitin Govil in *Bollywood Reader*, p. 201 ff

Bollywoods move towards corporatization

204. In 1998 Indian govt granted industry status to domestic film trade, Easing restriction on foreign collaboration under new regime Indian govt encouraged Indian film industry to look outward and recruit international capital via foreign media investment. Film and TV companies relieved of export related income tax. In 1999 Govt allowed foreign equity of 100% in film production and distribution legislating approval to foreign investment in film companies provided that local partners contributed 25% equity capital. Wholly owned subsidiaries of foreign majors given preference based on established track record in Indian market, consolidated the existing interrelationship of Indian producers and Hollywood distribution networks- state interested in capitalization of film production through enabling of **foreign investment**. Indian banks trusted with corporate funding for post cinema production, Industrial Devpt Bank of India sanctioned \$US13 M for film production in 2001 when income was \$US 800 m

Bollywood enacts **India as multimedia spectacle, shows how ethnic, regional, national identities being reconstructed in relation to globalized process of intercultural segmentation and hybridization** (206)

Have to confront the qu of the **national in mis-characterisation of Bollywood as Indian National cinema**—entrenched majoritarianism, when cohesion of national project coordinated by right wing movements like Shiv Sena—

monstrous alignment between cultural politics of nationalist primordialism and B's export oriented narratives. Politics of authenticity reproduced through expatriate Indians attempted reintegration in culture left to pursue wealth in west. Conflation between B's particularity and generality of Indian film industry ironic primary lg Hindi, implicate d in dissemination of an elite indian nationalism.

208 national mis-characterisation of Bollywood as Indian National cinema leads to identity narratives that articulate the exclusive condition of everyday living within a particular bounded realm, and inclusive category that can support portability of national identity, National particularity is potent universality (Hardt and Negri)- this antimony resolved in modern hindu nationalism whose claim is:

alternative universalism is no longer a critique of the west but a strategy to invigorate and stabilize a modern nationalising project through a disciplined and corporate cultural nationalism that can earn India recognition and equality (with West and other nations) through the assertion of difference (Blom Hansen 1999, 31)

Misrecognition of Bollywood as India's national cinema recasts fantasy of Hindi Cinema global relevance as a nightmare?

Production of singularity. Politics of hindu exception behind change to Mumbai – vernacular marker of indigenous urban modernity in support of Indian distinction in global commodity space—realises its 'original identity in terms of global present (avoid colonial)—branded and packaged into indian consumer culture evokes recovery of primordial cultural identity both activated by and protected from global present (as other national traditions). Hindi cinema a site for vernacularisation of Bombay, Bollywood creates a space for its dispersal through narratives of **global consumer mobility**. Since 1990s classic reps of Mumbai (footpath, rickshaw) have been anaesthetised and supplanted by symbolic spaces of commodity consumption like shopping mall and multiplex – spaces represent the projection of India into global commodity fantasy. Globalisation of Bwood situated within a Bombay defined by institutional and aesthetic strategies of disappearance – defined by preservation of locality and

transference into global entertainment space. Following economic liberalization policies of late 80s objective of Indian audiovisual policy has been to strike a balance between rich cultural heritage of nation and increased efficiency and global effectiveness of sector through privatisation and foreign investment.’ (Mukherjee 2003), Bombay provides a nodal point for B’woods articulation of popular cinema to Indian transnationalism. What BETTER PLACE TO REP, Bwoods global linkages than the reimagination of Bombay as real/imagined space?

David J. Schaefer and Kavita Karan, eds in *Bollywood and Globalization: the Global Power of Popular Hindi Cinema* (Routledge 2013) , ‘Bollywood and Contemporary Audiences’, 129-45.

CONTENT ANALYSIS based on 61 highest grossing films 1947-2007 form wide range of locations in india and abroad, Exam of relationship between Hindi cinematic trends and audience observations and practices- process re use Bwood as promoting india’s soft power,

Conclude Bollywood viewed as inc component in India’s attempt to transmit indigenous values, cultures and traditions to global audiences- so Hindi cinema los t much of its cultural uniqueness , becoming westernised. Interviewed 400 re how perceived presence of Indian and glob influence son Bollywood film content, when cf content analysis of highest grossing Hindi films, and own daily practices: Said Bwood’s content infrastructurally modern, geographically external, pop cultural, while their practices **culturally eastern**, infrastructurally modern, pop cultural,

What differences existed re geographical, cultural political, institutional, media-oriented perceptions and practices of Hindi film viewers inside/outside India ? Indigenous viewers supported Eastern culture, social customs and use trad institutional practices (no motorised transport growing own food), Indina goeography, leaders symbols, modern practices and pop culture (Cultural proximity effect); – viewers outside india interested in external geographical

locations, western style, attire, western lifestyles, and diasporic, political leaders.

Hindi viewers identify with hybridized indo-globalised orientation of popular cinema, counter these influences when residing in India; supported highly nationalist films than those in diaspora who liked non musical Hindi films like *A Wednesday*; Gehlawat's claim supported that polysemic and pastiche nature of Hindi film narratives encourages multiplicity of viewer interpretations

Anjali Gera Roy, 'Bollywood at Large: Who is Watching B'wood films?', 29-43.

39. Cosmopolitan rhetoric of conviviality: mignolo globalization as neoliberalism, 'rearticulates the colonial difference as a new form of coloniality of power, no longer located in one nation state or a group of states, but as transnational and trans-state global coloniality- dangers. B'woodization seen end of Indian cinema

•
1.

Responses in diaspora for this is not a **reterritorialised nationalism**: Clear that cannot think of this cinema in terms of simplistic dichotomised reading of nostalgia or resistance. **Changes within diaspora imaginary of India as homeland**. Latest research from critics like Desai in *Bollywood Reader*, is that the viewing of hindi /Bollywood cinema is not a form of nostalgia based on a longing to return and limited belonging within the host society. Not a reterritorialised nationalism, Consumption of homeland cultural products is not a passive act, caused by displacement but an active process of imagination and reproduction, As Gehlawat 136 says, **zones of transculturation, fluid transglobal identities**, hyperreal social formation of Bollywood as the fount of all identities, -- the diasporic imaginary is not full of these new images reinvention of India, but a new transnational site in which the relationship between the diaspora and the homeland is articulated, performed and defined—the Diasporic culture is not a replication of the original homeland, but the two are mutually constitutive. Dudrah, films become occasion where responses are worked out .

IN both films however it is the

This is brought out even more actively in Kaal No Ha No, set in the USA where the hero, arrives from India and sets about to transform

4. Kal No Ha No

In my third example

In *Kaal No Ha Han* see something similar. Again male bonded universe in which women are reduced in initiative and in playing roles. But lack of father also a critical shift for see NRI fills that role as well.

The film succeeded in establishing the transnational NRI's credibility as a cosmopolitan lifestyle- appealed to the urban middle class Indian. Overlaps with but not the same as the Indians in diaspora (CHECK SHARPE) – the 'Indianness' of the Indian national identity established through the hybridized NRI because of the new consumer culture-- there is some independence of the daughter. Bhattarcharya (17): Male body transformed, from spectacular resistance of 1980s (GENR) to painless corporatisation, masculinity recast as new liminality, traverses separate gendered spheres, palliating class struggle, dissolves social crisis, class conflict, neoliberalism triumphs over popular dissent

The centerpiece of the new revised imaginaries of India is in the presence of the father, and the generational challenge to his social control of domestic power through father and son relationship. This is even more strongly spelt out in Koran Johar's 3KG (Known as *The Indian Family* in Germany) (*Kabhi Kushi Kabhi Gham*) (2001), in which the son (Shah Rukh Khan), returns from school in England, rejects the father's (Amitabh Bachchan) parents proposed bride for the woman he has fallen in love with, and then being turned out of the family home (which looks like a feudal estate in Britain), returns to the UK and sets up as an independent entrepreneur. This film –while echoing the family dynamics of *Monsoon Wedding* and *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge* (The One with a True Heart will win the bride), shows family values like morality, trust and devotion being overlaid by the globalized consumer lifestyle which is at the core of the reinvented imaginaries/reformed. The family thrives/survives/ lives on its devotion to the industrial strength of patriarchy, there is no evidence of labour or domestic work or class struggle, but instead surplus capital is repeated the name of brand luxury. In this case the logic of the marketplace replaces human relations, -- significantly the father punishes the son not by cutting family ties but cutting his share of the family corporation; and the son distances himself so he can find the economic opportunities to earning millions like his father, and so equalize himself, Not surprisingly they make up in a shopping mall.

What happens to Diasporic longing for home here? (Dudrah, Sociology, 9)
A mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination, a diffuse object of longing, recollection memory, fabulation and imagination—there is none of the depictions of the catastrophic consequences of cultural loss, e.g. of the native language, the problematic and multiple acculturations that are required in diaspora that one finds in exilic filmmaking about the diasporic experience; or of the shifts in identity that come with creolization of culture and identity the need to maintain, revive and invent. There is none of the explicit indicators of living in a Diasporic state that one finds in British Asian cinema, e.g. in films like the adaptation by XXX of Monica Ali's novel *Brick Lane* where the homesick heroine – newly moved to London life to marry, receives regular letter from her sister in Bangladesh. We do find idealisation of homeland as in *Dilwale Dulhania Le*

Jayenge (The One with a True Heart will win the bride) where Simran's father, Balder Singh in London (Vocatin?) considers his Punjabi boyhood in romantic terms remembering women in the mustard fields in a folkloric image, and it is this impulse to realize a boyhood friendship that drives him to fix a love match for this daughter with his Punjabi friend); but in 3KG, the transnational family seems above all that, rather like royalty, **oblivious to the diasporic transformations of home because of their capitalist, global values, Concepts** of family, duty and nation are **in ether** a fantasy of tradition composed of consumer goods, family mansions, -- these offer **special comfort to assuage the nostalgia of India's Diasporic elite**. Money and family are interchangeable-- just as national locales in the corporatised world of high finance

As well as the patriarchal structure there is also the reinforced religious identity as neoliberal Bollywood's gendered practices and repertoires show the screen women's mobilisation as a conservative traditional consumer- a modern analogue to the Hindutva -- so women in the tableau of paterfamilias represent not just heightened consumerism but also entrepreneurial piety and in 3KG both mother in India and daughter in law in London perform pooja--religious ceremonies- beseeching the household gods for the well being of their respective families--wealth power, or affiliated consumerist nationalism on part of the daughter-in-law, more than a subjective spirituality. Pathos contains no tears or pain, engulfed in patriarchy, the profits of patriarchal familiarisation of devotion appear in the imagist constellation of pleasure and property that provide the mise en scene of the new piety. So modernity is reconfigured I the diaspora as 'religion'—slick montage matched ability of VAP (Bhattacharya) to forge sense of Hindu world, wide link up as one family with collective lives. Resurgence of state sponsored ascriptive ethnic identifications has taken shape in these 'diaspora delight' films (Pardes-Foreign (DATE) is another). The New **NRI dominated images refamiliarise patriarchal/ paternal gender ideologies in guise of rehumanising them**. (Bhattacharya 148-9) The nation state continues to supply the political imagination—monolith creates economic migrants, and mental and physical spaces as cultural subjects of apolitical globalisation. So genealogy of the new Diasporic hindutva identified family is pleasures and piety as painless, political, pietistic consumerist gendered experience Also absence of violence as modes of negotiation in neoliberal Diasporic Bollywood imagistic (Cf real Hindutva).

Fantasy space: along with fact that films about living in London is a new aestheticized command of space developed from globalisation/consumerism into a hyperreal space; families not about integrated living in diaspora. London seen as a place of multi-national capital, a galaxy of international stores, the real substituted with commercial equivalent, no longer the real but a site on which foreign elements are coopted. Tourism is more than sight recognition, substitute brand and the semiotic for the symbolic marker—conclude do the films reconcile global consumer lifestyle with the traditional indian values?

Fantasy provides links between different communities and social classes; and dissemination through song. (Dudrah).

How can one critique this? How to stand back and find new ways of reading these hegemonic narratives of success stories that remake the nation

through different narrative reconfigurations, other than as spectacle, drama, song and dance, , theatre. Problem lies in origins of such cinema which differentiates it from western modes and structures of entertainment presentational of representational bourgeois modes of Hollywood (story line).

2 The contrived 'authentic Indianness' of Bollywood/ Diasporic Indian Cinema's ideologically normative, hegemonising narratives that move between cultural hybridities and purities, with reference to its critical reception in the diaspora (i.e. 'Bollyworld'). How do the national/ transnational cultural identities and values of a reframed Hindu national identity **inform imaginaries with in the diaspora of India as the original homeland** in new media landscapes where plural, hybridised identity structures are in constant (re)formation?

IN South Asian diasporic cinema making these multiple spaces. Trans-global identities are more clearly articulated; new image/stereotyping of upper middle class Indian appears in Gurinder Chadha's mainstream commercial film, *Bhaji on the Beach* (1993) about a group of women of Asian descent in Britain who go on a day outing to Blackpool; among them is a wealthy visitor from Mumbai, a reminder of the Asian communities world wide network, and a stereotyped image of India's global-westernized style through the semiotics of the dress code ; she is the only dressed in western clothes, and is demonstrably more elegant and expensively turned out than the British-Asian residents acknowledging the discrepancy between home and the diaspora where the women wear old fashioned western leisure clothes with Asian accessories. Counteracts idea of homeland as a source of nostalgia for these other women who had left 20 years ago, as no longer traditionally 'Asian'. (Bidding for the Mainstream 165),

1. Father patriarchy seen as powerful but ultimately tested out and found to be flawed in its dogmatic insistence on traditional vows and values. Cannot reinstate the exact system he would like. As with daughters and vulnerable females more positions available for fathers/symbolic roles cross over into paternity from one generation to another – . E.g. the dead father in *Kal Naa Ho No*—(set in the USA) has left a gap in heroine's life one of the reasons why she falls for Aman, not Rohit, is that he seems to supply the practical advice and support that she never had from her own father, encourages her to succeed in the world—new view of romance. Yet the limits of the authority of tyrannical and magisterial fathers of *Dilwale* and *3KG*, and traditional values of filial piety and loyalty they insist on, are overruled in both films-- both fathers are forced to accommodate to the different views of the younger generation and the right to choose even at risk of breaking up family. Travel/NRI/ transnationalism makes this more possible – to set up a parallel lifestyle

2. cinematic strategies of parody/ imitation which build on camp or queer politics as used in transcultural cultural production, challenge ideas of authenticity by deconstruction of fixed essential categories: Challenge in various films like *Monsoon Wedding*, of child possibly gay want to be an actor resists parents plans for him to be a doctor etc loves dressing up, looks feminine in some scenes; made more explicit in *English/Vinglish* about a woman who joins language teaching school instructor is gay and so is one of the pupils, (black African) who had seemed an outsider- in dance scene at final wedding see they

come together, have their own version of movement. Interpretations of Kil No Ha
No—film uses are mocking /parodic

1. Surveys of viewers: Undertaken in certain parts of the world
Bibliography

Jigna Desau, 'Ever Since You've Discovered the Video, I've Had no Peace', in *Bollywood Reader*, ed. Rajinder Dudrah and

New paradigms

Indianness a reduced cipher in global market place. (Gelhwat - preface)

'Bollywood and the Frictions of Global Mobility', Nitin Govil in *Bollywood Reader*, p. 201 ff

Bollywoods move twds corporatization

204. In 1998 Indian govt granted industry status to domestic film trade, Easing restriction on foreign collaboration under new regime Indian govt encouraged Indian film industry to look outward and recruit international capital via foreign media investment. Film and TV companies relieved of export related income tax. In 1999 Govt allowed foreign equity of 100% in film production and distribution legislating approval to foreign investment in film companies provided that local partners contributed 25% equity capital. Wholly owned subsidiaries of foreign majors given preference based on established track record in Indian market, consolidated the existing interrelationship of Indian producers and Hollywood distribution networks- state interested in capitalization of film production through enabling of **foreign investment**. Indian banks trusted with corporate funding for post cinema production, Industrial Devpt Bank of India sanctioned \$US13 M for film production in 2001 when income was \$US 800 m

Bollywood enacts India as multimedia spectacle, shows how ethnic, regional, national identities being reconstructed in relation to globalized process of intercultural segmentation and hybridization (206)

Have to confront the qu of the **national in mis-characterisation of Bollywood as Indian National cinema**—entrenched majoritarianism, when cohesion of national project coordinated by right wing movements like Shiv Sena—monstrous alignment between cultural politics of nationalist primordialism and B's export oriented narratives. Politics of authenticity reproduced through expatriate Indians attempted reintegration in culture left to pursue wealth in west. Conflation between B's particularity and generality of Indian film industry ironic primary lg Hindi, implicated in dissemination of an elite indian nationalism.

208 national mis-characterisation of Bollywood as Indian National cinema leads to identity narratives that articulate the exclusive condition of everyday living within a particular bounded realm, and inclusive category that can support portability of national identity, National particularity is potent universality (Hardt and Negri)- this antimony resolved in modern hindu nationalism whose claim is:

alternative universalism is no longer a critique of the west but a strategy to invigorate and stabilize a modern nationalising project through a disciplined and corporate cultural nationalism that can earn India recognition and equality

(with West and other nations) through the assertion of difference (Blom Hansen 1999, 31)

Misrecognition of Bollywood as India's national cinema recasts fantasy of Hindi Cinema global relevance as a nightmare?

Production of singularity. Politics of hindu exception behind change to Mumbai – vernacular marker of indigenous urban modernity in support of Indian distinction in global commodity space—realises its 'original identity in terms of global present (avoid colonial)—branded and packaged into indian consumer culture evokes recovery of primordial cultural identity both activated by and protected from global present (as other national traditions). Hindi cinema a site for vernacularisation of Bombay, Bollywood creates a space for its dispersal through narratives of global consumer mobility. Since 1990s classic reps of Mumbai (footpath, rickshaw) have been anaesthetised and supplanted by symbolic spaces of commodity consumption like shopping mall and multiplex – spaces represent the projection of India into global commodity fantasy. Globalisation of Bwood situated within a Bombay defined by institutional and aesthetic strategies of disappearance – defined by preservation of locality and transference into global entertainment space. Following economic liberalization policies of late 80s objective of Indian audiovisual policy has been to strike a balance between rich cultural heritage of nation and increased efficiency and global effectiveness of sector through privatisation and foreign investment.' (Mukherjee 2003), Bombay provides a nodal point for B'woods articulation of popular cinema to Indian transnationalism. What BETTER PLACE TO REP, Bwoods global linkages than the reimagination of Bombay as real/imagined space?

David J. Schaefer and Kavita Karan, eds in *Bollywood and Globalization: the Global Power of Popular Hindi Cinema* (Routledge 2013), 'Bollywood and Contemporary Audiences', 129-45.

CONTENT ANALYSIS based on 61 highest grossing films 1947-2007 from wide range of locations in india and abroad, Exam of relationship between Hindi cinematic trends and audience observations and practices- process re use Bwood as promoting india's soft power,

Conclude Bollywood viewed as inc component in India's attempt to transmit indigenous values, cultures and traditions to global audiences- so Hindi cinema loses much of its cultural uniqueness, becoming westernised. Interviewed 400 re how perceived presence of Indian and glob influence on Bollywood film content, when cf content analysis of highest grossing Hindi films, and own daily practices: Said Bwood's content infrastructurally modern, geographically external, pop cultural, while their practices **culturally eastern**, infrastructurally modern, pop cultural, What differences existed re geographical, cultural political, institutional, media-oriented perceptions and practices of Hindi film viewers inside/outside India? Indigenous viewers supported Eastern culture, social customs and use traditional institutional practices (no motorised transport growing own food), Indian geography, leaders symbols, modern practices and pop culture (Cultural

proximity effect); – viewers outside india interested in external geographical locations, western style, attire, western lifestyles, and diasporic, political leaders.

Hindi viewers identify with hybridized indo-globalised orientation of popular cinema, counter these influences when residing in India; supported highly nationalist films than those in diaspora who liked non musical Hindi films like A Wednesday; Gehlawat's claim supported that polysemic and pastiche nature of Hindi film narratives encourages multiplicity of viewer interpretations

Anjali Gera Roy, 'Bollywood at Large: Who is Watching B'wood films?', 29-43.
39. Cosmopolitan rhetoric of conviviality: mignolo globalization as neoliberalism, 'rearticulates the colonial difference as a new form of coloniality of power, no longer located in one nation state or a group of states, but as transnational and trans-state global coloniality- dangers. B'woodization seen end of Indian cinemas global capitalism privileged certain kind of cinematic production over the OTHER in manner similar to that in which Karan Johar prdn, targeting a global audience, silenced the art house genre of the 1970s and village film (Rajadhyaksha 2003).

Conclusion: Transnational market rather than the national state regulates cinematic production distribution consumption in which cinematic practices are articulated to other media assemblages and spaces that propagate the ideologies of capitalist consumption. The critique of the multiplex film as shifting the address of the hindi film from the slum or middle class view of the world to that of the globalized or NRI consumer emerges from these concerns about global designs through which locality is produced in global circuits of production, circulation and consumption.

Global design of market is resisted by small actors and local histories word of mouth publicity by fans on social networking websites and circulation of films on You Tube have reproduced in cyberspace the parallel economy of Hindi films. Not all large scale films gain Bollywood audiences. Hidden from global gaze the emergence of a transnational Bhojpuri cinema with audiences in the indian diaspora or parallel film industry in Malegao (nr Mumbai) and success of small budget films in Hindi, and diaspora English language films reinscribe local histories through which global design of market is resisted

[(so family films are not about living in diaspora as Chadra's films like Bend it Like Beckham, East is East or Bhaji on the Beach are—quite the opposite the wish to articulate an unsullied form of Hindu purism)].

The shift towards globalization began with the liberalising policies of the late

Question of relation of global imaginaries to concept of nation and national belonging Vasudevan in Dwyer: state no longer interested in rendering authentic family identity through a national aesthetic (7-8 **Brand India**, not about form as in cultural identity through national aesthetic, but in the branding of India?? I.e. at level of high profile Bombay film, displacement of nation as art form by **nation as brand** (distinction from products which circulate widely in service global nation in identity- Brand India in bid to convert to brand equity). Second question symbolic shift

In this paper I will 1. focusing on reconstructions of its aesthetics, narratives and ideologies over the last 25 years since the liberalization policies of the 1990s. I will argue that in Diaspora Cinema/Bollywood ideologies of gender, class, and religion have been inflected by **a transnational Hindutva modernism and capitalist consumerism**. These are identifiable with the apolitical globalization that ignores social realities, and builds on the fan base of superstars like Shah Rukh Khan; I will then examine the reception and ways of reading this cinema that gives some meaning to the Diasporic experience.

The centrality of family films was not accidental, for when/ The reformist imaginary and legitimacy, as a project of identity, addresses its audiences as part of the family on the basis of family values—claimed by whole culture, as authentic (Is it authentically national?)

The remapping of national boundaries took place at one level through reference to the politics of gender – namely the moral compass of DDLJ and other films like *Monsoon Wedding*, is found in the need to preserve the sexual purity of women: the young female is a site of danger requiring family consolidation and male protection to maintain her chastity. The female, both younger girls, mothers and grandmothers, provides the ethical and affective mobilisations for the action. But

The same family structure – a ruling patriarch and vulnerable female characters, limited position of the mother figure- can be seen in Meera Nair's *Monsoon Wedding* in 2001 set in Delhi, but made in USA, to which all the family are invited—issue/sanctity of woman's sexuality in relation to the arranged marriage is highlighted through three scenarios: the daughter who is to enter an arranged marriage with an US NRI (IT expert), who has a married lover who is a talkback/TV presenter (but decides to marry anyway and tells her husband to be of her prior relationship) the young girl who is being exploited by a family member who comes of age at the wedding, but who is eventually exposed and is sent away; thirdly the caste/working class story serving girl who falls in love with

the technician, who is catholic not hindu; but is courted by him; in the same way this also remains a patriarchal affair: the father has to overcome the issues of finance (borrows money for the wedding) and also has to make the decision about casting out another man for his behavior. Woman has limited agency, but is often demoted to modest roles e.g. the mother in this film is seen in terms of heightened consumerism, or commodification, talked of as being high maintenance, causing husband to work even harder to support her and family. IN all films associated with entrepreneurial piety – the family dominates, men associated with successful enterprise, patriarchal authority have the dominant roles (Bhattacharya, 139), women play support roles in scenarios of capitalist cultural nationalisms, as driving the consumerist apparatus, in *Dilwale* the son persuades(not by force or elopement); the women have limited agency and a secondary role

In age of economic liberalisation, technocracy is the genesis of a transnational Hindu modernity, whose common matrix is capital conscious consumerism. (Bhattacharya, 135-6)

In neither of these films is there any explicit focus on the diasporic longing for home and homeland, or of the desire to return ? (Dudrah, Sociology ,9) A mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination, a diffuse object t of longing, recollection memory, fabulation and imagination—there is none of the depictions of the catastrophic consequences of cultural loss, e.g. of the native language, the problematic and multiple acculturations that are require in diaspora that one finds in exilic filmmaking about the disaporic experience; or of the shifts in identity that come with creolization of culture and identity the need to maintain, revive and invent. There is none of the explicit indicators of living in a Diasporic state that one finds in British Asian cinema, e.g. in films like the adaptation by XXX of Monica Ali's novel *Brick Lane* where the homesick heroine – newly moved to London life to marry, receives regular letter from her sister in Bangladesh. We do find idealisation of homeland as in *Dilwale Dulhaniya Le Jayenge* (The One with a True Heart will win the bride) where Simran's father, Balder Singh in London (Vocatin?) con siders his Punjabi boyhood in romantic terms remembering women in the mustard fields in a folkloric image , and it is this impulse to realize a boyhood friendship that drives him to fix a love match for this daughter with his Punjabi friend); but in 3KG, the transnational family seems above all that, rather like royalty, **oblivious to the diasporic transformations of home because of their capitalist, global values, Concepts** of family, duty and nation are **in ether** a fantasy of tradition composed of consumer goods, family mansions, -- these offer **special comfort to assuage the nostalgia of India's Diasporic elite**. Money and family are interchangeable- just as national locales in the corporatised world of high finance

In Koran Johar's film, 3KG, this family battle occurs within the context of a transnational Hindu modernity, which shows East and West as almost interchangeable ideologically, because of the common matrix of capital

conscious consumerism. In the film's confrontation between father and son (one in which the women play an even more diminished role) threatened family values are located within a consumerised corporate lifestyle. The son (Shah Rukh Khan) returns from school in England, rejects the father's (Amitabh Bachchan) proposed match because he has fallen in love with another woman he has fallen in love with, and then being turned out of the family home), returns to the UK and sets up as an independent entrepreneur. This film –while echoing the family dynamics of *Monsoon Wedding* and *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge* (The One with a True Heart will win the bride)- shows family values like morality, trust and devotion being overlaid by the globalized consumer lifestyle which is at the core of the reinvented imaginaries. The family thrives on its devotion to the industrial strength of patriarchy, there is no evidence of labour or domestic work or class struggle, but instead surplus capital constantly being repeated in the name of brand luxury. In this case the logic of the marketplace replaces human relations, -- significantly the father punishes the son not just by cutting family ties but cutting his share of the family corporation; and the son distances himself so he can find the economic opportunities to earning millions like his father, and so equalize himself. Here, as in DDLJ, the challenge to patriarchy from the NRI who wishes to marry the woman he loves— shows that the paternal insistence on piety, filial obedience, and duty, can become secondary to the lifestyle choices of the NRI, even though these are in significant ways repetitions of the fathers. Yet see the difference between father and son in their acting styles.

This revision of geographical sites, and the neutralization of contrasting images of home shows a new technique of filming, in films about living in London is a new aestheticized command of space developed from globalisation/consumerism into a hyperreal space; families are represented in 3KG and Kal Ho Na Ho as not about integrated living in diaspora, but as a series of fragmented consumer oriented, highly ?? moments. London seen as a place of multi-national capital, a galaxy of international stores, the real substituted with its commercial equivalent, as no longer the real but a site onto which foreign elements and brands have been positioned. Tourism is more than sight recognition, substitute brand and the semiotic for the symbolic marker— conclude do the films reconcile global consumer lifestyle with the traditional indian values?

The [major shift [in revising the national imaginaries due to the] neoliberalising and globalising of Hindi cinema] began 1998 when the Indian state recognized the cinema as an industry and opened the way for its infrastructural and credit support, with the Film Finance Corporation (FFC) and the National Film Development Corporation (NFDC). By 2000 through the Industrial Development Bank Act, the industry became eligible for financial support from 'legitimate' institutions (i.e. banks- the Industrial Development Bank of India) helped professionalise the industry for borrowing only allowed to corporate entities and not more than 50% of total cost could be borrowed (weeded out non professional, amateur lower grade films), Foreign investment encouraged, and Indian films were presented at Cannes for the first time in 2001 (Monika Mehta, *Once Upon A Time in Bollywood* 'Globalising Bombay Cinema'). In the same year the growth of the multiplex was encouraged by removing the

entertainment tax for screenings (new tax benefits under Maharashtra's multiplex policy- higher prices for tickets).

Revising National / Diasporic Imaginaries: Bollywood & Diasporic Indian Cinema and Globalization

As Diasporic Indian Cinema/Bollywood is one of the key cultural sites for the production of the national imaginary, this paper will focus on reconstructions of its aesthetics, narratives and ideologies following the country's economic liberalization policies of the 1990s. These will be contextualized in relation to India's globalized economy, new promotional aids to production, financing, marketing and distribution of Diasporic Indian/Bollywood cinema, diaspora audiences, and new media technologies.

With reference to the genre of the family melodrama, and performances of NRI-dominated Indian identities, the paper will argue that ideologies of gender, class, and religion have been inflected by a **transnational Hindutva modernism** and **capitalist consumerism** in this blockbuster cinema. These are identifiable with the apolitical globalization that informs neoliberal Bollywood's success, ignores social realities, and builds on the fan base of superstars like Shah Rukh Khan.

Finally the paper considers the contrived 'authentic Indianness' of Bollywood/ Diasporic Indian Cinema's ideologically normative, hegemonising narratives that move between cultural hybridities and purities, with reference to its critical reception in the diaspora (i.e. 'Bollywood'). How do the national/ transnational cultural identities and values of **a reframed Hindu national identity inform diasporic imaginaries of India as the original homeland** in the new media landscapes where plural, hybridised identity structures are in constant (re)formation?

Reference will be made to films such as Meera Nair's *Monsoon Wedding* (2001) Aditya Chopra's *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge* (The True of Heart Will Win the Bride, 1995), Karan Johar's *Kabhi Khushi Kabhi Gham* (Sometimes Happiness, Sometimes Sadness, 2001), and Gauri Shinde's *English/Vinglish* (2013).